

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/590,805	06/09/2000	Frederick T. Brady	FE-00439	FE-00439 1713	
22838	7590 07/24/2002				
DEMONT & BREYER, LLC			EXAMINER		
	P.O. BOX 7490 SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702-7490		NADAV, ORI		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2811		
		,	DATE MAILED: 07/24/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	0110
. Advisory Action	09/590, 805 ·	BRADY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	ori nadav	2811	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2002 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	cation. A proper rep ich places the applic	ply to a cation in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the statute of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S 136(a) and the appropriate e fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant' 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		•
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed	d amendment
5.⊠ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7 and 22-25</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)□ approved or b)□ disap	proved by the Exan	niner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:	•	Jom In	
	T() w ~~)M THOMAS BY PATENT EXAMINE	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

The examiner maintains the position that the claimed invention is prima facie obvious over applied prior art (see paper 8).